

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION**

ENTRY ON JURISDICTION

It has come to the Court’s attention that Plaintiff’s Complaint fails to allege all of the facts necessary to determine whether this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this case. The Complaint alleges that this Court has jurisdiction based upon diversity of citizenship. However, the Complaint fails to sufficiently allege the citizenship of the Plaintiff. Citizenship is the operative consideration for jurisdictional purposes. *See Meyerson v. Harrah’s East Chicago Casino*, 299 F.3d 616, 617 (7th Cir. 2002) (“residence and citizenship are not synonyms and it is the latter that matters for purposes of the diversity jurisdiction”).

The Complaint alleges that “Plaintiff Edward Stevens is and was at all relevant times an adult resident citizen of the United State residing in the County of Cuyahoga, State of Ohio.” ([Filing No. 1 at 1](#).) This allegation of state residency is not sufficient to allow the Court to determine whether diversity jurisdiction exists.

Therefore, the Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to file a Supplemental Jurisdictional Statement that establishes the Court's jurisdiction over this case. This statement should specifically identify the state citizenship of the Plaintiff. This jurisdictional statement is due **fourteen (14) days** from the date of this Entry.

SO ORDERED.

Date: 8/11/2016



TANYA WALTON PRATT, JUDGE
United States District Court
Southern District of Indiana

Distribution:

Jeff S. Gibson
COHEN & MALAD LLP
jgibson@cohenandmalad.com

Edward B. Mulligan, V
COHEN & MALAD LLP
emulligan@cohenandmalad.com